

**JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY**  
**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICIES**

Angela Krueger, Catherine Sherman, Todd Bruce, John Ambrose, Rebecca Drenovsky,  
Margaret Farrar, Rick Greci, Jim Krukones, Anne Kugler, Kathleen Manning, Al Miciak,  
Michelle Millet, Maryclaire Moroney, Olivia Shackleton, and Walter Simmons

November 7, 2018  
9:00am, CAS Conference Room

**NOTES**

Present: J. Krukones, J. Ambrose, M. Moroney, A. Kugler, K. Manning, R. Drenovsky, A. Krueger, T. Bruce, C. Sherman

The minutes from October 24<sup>th</sup> were approved.

C. Sherman opened the meeting by reminding the committee of the four policies currently posted for public comment, which closes November 15<sup>th</sup>. The course scheduling survey period has ended; A. Krueger and C. Sherman will compile the feedback to present at the next meeting. C. Sherman noted upcoming spring committee work, including proposals on the residency requirement for minors/concentrations; use of previously conferred undergraduate degrees; and final exam regulations. The suggested UCAdP policies have been tabled for now.

C. Sherman thanked T. Bruce for bringing GPA and student type data for continued discussion on Academic Sanctions policy. Transitioning next, A. Krueger recalled a discussion from the previous meeting around the Academic Sanctions policy proposal. R. Drenovsky had mentioned it would be beneficial to see what types of student populations would be most affected by the policy change and if a 2.0 GPA would be the appropriate cutoff to use. T. Bruce was present to provide data in an effort to bring clarity as to what those populations might be. After looking at all second semester students since 2012, it was discovered there were only 207 students who carried below a 2.0 GPA, or about 35 students per cohort. He then applied a variety of filters to that subset to see if any trends could be identified, including commuter, athlete, first generation, high school GPA, test scores, intended major, outcomes, and gender. R. Drenovsky observed that the data seemed to indicate that the majority of those students under a 2.0 were those that 1) underperformed on high school standardized tests and 2) were male but ultimately there was no one indicator to focus on. After reviewing the data, C. Sherman then pivoted the conversation back to the main point of debate: whether to recommend in the policy a standard 2.0 GPA threshold or to utilize a graduated scale. In support of the 2.0 threshold, R. Drenovsky remarked that it didn't appear as though there was enough data to support the claim that the policy as written would adversely affect athletes, and suggested that not being able to participate in extracurricular leadership roles wouldn't be a bad thing. C. Sherman also mentioned that under the policy, students would still have the ability to petition to practice on sports teams. K. Manning maintained that we should provide students an extra semester to be given a chance to be guided out of courses or majors that might not be the best fit for them. Before he left for another meeting, she asked T. Bruce to filter the data by a 1.9 GPA rather than a 2.0 to see how dropping the threshold would impact the affected population. The data did

not seem to indicate that dropping the threshold to a 1.9 would make a demonstrable difference either way.

Transitioning discussion back to the academic sanctions policy itself, C. Sherman highlighted several changes that had been made since the committee last met. A statement defining what it means to be in good academic standing, conclusive term limits, and an appeals process and timeline are now included. R. Drenovsky observed and appreciated that the major and Boler core are now included as indicators of satisfactory progress towards degree completion, however she still feels strongly that students are not switching out of unsuitable majors quick enough, thus making it more difficult to complete others. In an effort to better help and potentially identify those students who may be struggling earlier, R. Drenovsky asked that all department chairs be given Banner access to those in their respective department cohorts. M. Moroney observed that while it may allow for tough conversations to happen earlier, it wouldn't necessarily speed up the sanctions process, as students would still be placed on academic probation or warning for the same amount of semesters. She also expressed that while there are support measures in place for those students on some sort of academic sanction, such as enrollment in AR 112, credit hour registration limitations, etc., there are no mechanisms in place to ensure these measures are being adhered to. Assuming the proposed mid-term grade policy is adopted, A. Krueger questioned whether this might help to assist in identifying struggling students earlier. C. Sherman posited that some sort of automatic academic report with data, sent out at key periods of the semester, might be helpful as well. The designation of an office to be responsible for blocking and placing registration holds was also discussed, however it was uncertain as to what that implementation might look like. R. Drenovsky suggested looking at other local universities to see how they handle it. A. Krueger questioned how Ms. L. Schneck and Mr. P. Lombardo handle registering Boler students and what authority they have. A. Kugler then reminded the group that the current proposed policy is for defining academic sanctions thresholds, not revising intervention practices, although perhaps there might be a need to address those down the road. After additional conversation, the committee agreed to send the proposal to Faculty Council, making sure to include both supporting data and an alternative option proposing a threshold of 1.9 GPA or above.

Next, A. Krueger provided an update on the Experiential Education Policy Proposal. After consulting with C. Wenzel, the Assistant Vice President of Enrollment and Financial Services, she informed the committee that the PR grade can last on a student's record for longer than 14 days. However, if the course operates outside the 14 day window, it isn't eligible for financial aid. Language indicating this was added to the proposal. A. Krueger suggested sending this proposal to Faculty Council as well to make them aware, but not for review or to garner recommendations.

C. Sherman confirmed that the Academic Sanctions and Experiential Education policy proposals will go to Faculty Council. After J. Krukones clarified that this would be the only meeting in November due to Thanksgiving, the meeting officially concluded at 10:02am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne

